

★

116 53 (169)
36
(6)
(7) (28)
(21)
(6)
" "
(0,01)
" "
(0 ,01)
(0,01)

(Harris,
.1980, p.21)

. (291 1992)

.(22 1991)
Training Need
(TNA) Assessment

)

.(106 1992

1987)

(115

(407 1986)

(7 1976)

)

.(29 1984

.

)

.(7 1986

.

.

(18 1987)

.(21 1986)

.(Fenstermacher and Berliner, 1988)

1994

.(14 1995)
(Alkin, 1978, p.151)

-3

)
%86 .(6 1995

(

:

:

-1

.

:

-2

.(7 1995)

%76

)

-3

(10 1995

)

) (1995) (1995) (1995
.(1995) (1995

-4

-

-

.

.

:

.

:

-1

:

-1

-2

()

-2

-3

(56 1993)

:

(53) (169) -1

(116)

: (409)
(1991) (%28,4)

-2

(36)

(79)

(11)

(8)

(1992)

—

— 1992 /1991 :

(150)

:

-1

-2

(1992)

28 36) (64) (

(George and Nelson, 1971)

(24))

.(
)
.(
(1993)

(Ingersoll, 1976)

(745) (44) :

(86)

(10)
(Davis, 1984)

(1993)

(23) 1992 /1991
(454)

(Wade, 1985)

(Tillema, 1994)

(146)

-1

(Ingersol, 1976)

(Rod Bramald

(George et al., 1995)

and Nelson, 1971)

((Davis, 1984)

(Rod Bramald et al., 1995)

(1993)

) (Tillema, 1994)

(62)

(1992) (1992

(1993)

.(2000)

-2

1993

(Tillema,

1994)

2000

-3

(George and Nelson, 1971)

(Wade, 1985)

(2000)

(Tillema, 1994)

(Rod Bramald et al., 1995)

-4

(1993)

155

(Davis, 1984)

42

(Wade, 1985)

(George and Nelson,

(53) (169) 1971) -5

(116) (1993)
(2000)

(409) (Ingersol, 1976)
(%28.4)

:

(%68)

(1)

(1)

		:	
44	51		1
56	65		2
100	116		
		:	
34	40	(3-1)	1
42	49	(6-4)	2
15	18	(9-7)	3
6	7	(12-10)	4
3	2	(... 13)	5
100	116		
		:	
44	51		1
56	65		2
100	116		

)

(

(53)

(1277)
(%68) (868)
(%32) (409)

125 161

.(286)

.(123) 87

36

:

(2)

()

14	8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 14 13 12 11 10 9		1
		:	2
4	18 17 16 15		
12	24 23 22 21 20 19 30 29 28 27 26 25		
6	36 35 34 33 32 31		
36			

(3)

1	4,1	1	3,9	1	4,3		1
2	3,8	2	3,4	2	4,1		2
3	3,6	3	3,3	3	3,9		3
5	3,1	5	2,9	4	3,3		4
6	2,9	6	2,6	5	3,2		5
4	3,2	4	3,2	6	3,1		6
7	2,7	7	2,4	7	2,9		7
8	2,5	8	2,3	8	2,7		8
9	2,4	8	2,3	9	2,4		9
10	2,3	10	2,2	10	2,3		10
10	2,3	10	2,2	10	2,3		11
12	2,2	10	2,2	12	2,2		12
12	2,2	10	2,2	13	2,1		13
14	2	14	2	14	2		14

1988)
 .(1993 1991
 .(250 -249 1973)
 (36)
 (2)

(4)

2	3,6	2	3,4	1	3,8		1
1	3,7	1	3,7	2	3,7		2
3	3,5	2	3,4	3	3,5		3
4	3,4	5	3,2	3	3,5		4
4	3,4	4	3,3	3	3,5		5
6	3,2	10	2,9	3	3,5		6
11	3,1	14	2,8	7	3,4		7
6	3,2	10	2,9	7	3,4		8
6	3,2	7	3	9	3,3		9
6	3,2	7	3	9	3,3		10
6	3,2	7	3	9	3,3		11
11	3,1	10	2,9	9	3,3		12
13	3	16	2,7	9	3,3		13
18	2,8	18	2,6	14	3		14
18	2,8	20	2,5	14	3		15
15	2,9	14	2,8	14	3		16
15	2,9	16	2,7	14	3		17
13	3	6	3,1	18	2,9		18
15	2,9	10	2,9	18	2,9		19
18	2,8	18	2,6	18	2,9	()	20
21	2,6	21	2,4	21	2,8		21
22	2,5	22	2,3	22	2,6		22

(5)

		:	
1	4,1		1
2	3,8		2
3	3,6		3
		:	
1	3,7		1
2	3,6		2
3	3,5		3

(6)

1	4 ,1		1
2	3 ,9		2
3	3 ,7		3
3	3 ,7		4
3	3 ,7		5
6	3 ,6		6
7	3 ,5		7
8	3 ,4		8
8	3 ,4		9
10	3 ,1		10
11	3		11
12	2 ,4		12
13	2 ,3		13
14	2 ,1		14

() . :

.

) Likert

(15)

(

1 2 3 4 5

180

36

60 80 100 :

.20 40

-2

.

:

-1

:

:

.

:

(18)

(T-test) " "

(Cronbach

(0.95)

Alpha)

(Kendal's Coefficient of

.Concordance)

:

(18)

" "

(0.88)

()

.(ANOVA)

:

:

:

:

1 ,4 – 1 ,0

2 ,4 – 1 ,5

3 ,4 – 2 ,5

4 ,4 – 3 ,5

5 ,0 – 4 ,5

Statistical Package for Social Sciences

.(SPSS)

(7)

1	4 ,4		1
1	4 ,4		2
1	4 ,4		3
4	4 ,3		4
5	4 ,1		5
5	4 ,1		6
5	4 ,1		7
5	4 ,1		8
9	4		9
9	4	()	10
9	4		11
12	3 ,8		12
12	3 ,8		13
12	3 ,8		14
12	3 ,8		15
12	3 ,8		16
17	3 ,6		17
17	3 ,6		18
19	3 ,5		19
19	3 ,5		20
19	3 ,5		21
22	2 ,8		22

:

:

.

-

(3)

.(4.1)

.(3.8)

-

.

-

(3)

.(3.6)

(4.3 -2)

-2)

(3.9 -2)

(5)

(4.1

-2.5)

(%36)

:

(3.2

.

-

.(3 ,2)

(%21)

.(3.1)

-

(%7)

-

.(%21)

.(2.9)

(4.1-3.6)

(8)

		:	
1	4,1		1
2	3,9		2
3	3,7		3
3	3,7		4
3	3,7		5
6	3,6		6
6	3,6		7
		:	
1	4,4		1
1	4,4		2
1	4,4		3
4	4,3		4
5	4,1		5
5	4,1		6
5	4,1		7
5	4,1		8
9	4		9
9	4	()	10
9	4		11
12	3,8		12
12	3,8		13
12	3,8		14
12	3,8		15
12	3,8		16
17	3,6		17
17	3,6		18
19	3,5		19
19	3,5		20
19	3,5		21

(9)

" "

**5,14	23,04	95,21			
	16,14	114,13			
**3,67	7,26	25,81			
	5,70	29,60			
**6,09	18,03	68,36			
	12,34	85,00			

0,01

**

(10)

" "

**2,72	6,50	27,82		
	7,49	24,09		
0,86	19,30	70,00		
	16,95	60,00		
0,78	24,25	97,12		
	21,45	93,30		

0 ,01

**

(11)

" "

0,25	21,64	92,00		
	24,11	98,00		
0,38	6,57	25,02		
	7,75	26,28		
1,02	17,68	66,32		
	18,36	70,36		

(12)

1,73	95,38	381,50	4	
	54,97	4727,79	86	
		5109,29	90	

(13)

,92	300,12	1200,47	4	
	327,74	21631,19	66	
		22831,66	70	

(14)

1,29	683,37	2733,49	4	
	530,15	32339,13	61	
		35072,62	65	

(3.8 -2.6)

(3.7 -2.3)

.(2.7)

-

(3.7 -2.5)

-

.(2.5)

(%43)

(6)

(%27)

(6)

.(2.4-2)

(%4.5)

(Kendall)

(%14)

(3)

.(0.01)

(0.94)

-3.5)

.(3.7

:

-

.(3,7)

-

.(3,6)

-

.(3,5)

(1995

) (1993

)

.(2000

)

(%87)

(19)

.(3,4 -2,5)

-

: (3,4 -3,1)

:

-

(4)

.(3.4)

.(3,4)

-

-

(4)

	(2)		.(3,2)	-
			.(3,2)	-
			.(3,2)	-
			.(3,2)	-
.			.(3,2)	-
			.(3.1)	-
:	:		.(3,1)	-

(%50)

(2)

-3)

(3.4

.(2.4-2.1)

:

.(1995

)

(%86)

.(1995

)

(7)

(8)

(4.4-2.8)

(%95)

(21)

.(4.4-3.5)

" "

(2.8)

" " (9)

(7)

(9)

.(0.01)

" "

.(1993)

" " (11)

(%5)

(8)

(Davis,

.1984), (Ingersoll, 1976)

:

:

()

.(1)

" "

(10)

" "

(10)

-1

.(0.01)

(Davis, 1984; Ingersoll, 1976; Rod Bramald et al., 1995)

(12)

-2

-1

(13)

-2

-3

-3

()

-1

.()

(14)

-2

(1993)

(2000)

1973

1995

1986

1995

1992

1995

1987

1992

()

1986

1995

1976

1995

1991

1995

1991

1993

(2)

1988

1987

1984

1993

Alkin, M.C. 1973. Evaluation Theory Development, in B.R. Worthern and J.R. Sanders (EDS), *Educational Evaluation Theory and Practice*, Charles A.Jones Publishing Co, New York.

1992

Bramald, Rod et al. 1995. Initial Trainees and their Views of Teaching and Learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11 (1): 23-31.

1995

Davies. P.C. 1984. Teacher and Principals of Teacher, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 45 (3): 815.

Fenstermacher and Berliner. 1988. *A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Staff Development*, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica.

2000

George. D.K. and Nelson, A.M. 1971. Effect of an In-

- Tillema, H. 1994. Training and Professional Expertise's Bridging the Gap Between New Information and Pre-Existing Beliefs of Teachers, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10 (6): 601-615.
- Wade, R.K. 1985. What Makes A Difference in In-Service Teacher Education A Meta-Analysis of Research. *Educational Leadership*, 42: 68-54.
- Service Science Workshop on the Ability of Teacher to Use the Techniques of Inquiry, *Science Education*, 55 (2): 163-169.
- Harris, Benm. 1980. *Improving Staff Performance Through In Service Education*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc, Boston.
- Ingersoll, G.M. 1976. Assessing In-Service Training Needs Through Teacher Responses. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 27 (2): 169-175.

The Training Needs of Islamic Education Teachers in the Sultanate of Oman from the Point of View of the Supervisors and the Teachers Themselves, and their Relationship with Some Variables

*Saleh Diab Hindi**

ABSTRACT

This research aimed at recognizing the needs of Islamic education teachers at both the preparatory and secondary stages in the Sultanate of Oman, in addition to investigating the relationship between those needs and the teachers' sex, years of experience and the level they teach. The population of this research consisted of Islamic education supervisors and Islamic education teachers who teach in the preparatory and secondary stages in the schools located in ten regions in the Sultanate. The sample consisted of 169 educators (53 supervisors and 116 teachers) who were selected randomly. A 36-item questionnaire was used to collect data.

Research results as related to the first question revealed that the most important training needs that teachers agreed upon were six needs: three of them in the domain of knowledge of Islamic education curriculum, and three needs in the domain of curriculum teaching skills. As related to the second question, research results revealed 28 important training needs viewed by the supervisors. Seven needs were in the domain of knowledge of Islamic education, and 21 needs in the domain of curriculum teaching skills. Both supervisors and teachers (males and females) agreed on six important needs, four in the curriculum domain, and two in the skills domain. Statistical analysis through applying the t-test, revealed that there were significant differences in the means of the training needs between teachers of both sexes and the supervisors in the domain of curriculum, skills and measurement in favor of the supervisors at the ($\alpha = 0.01$) level. With regard to the third question, t-test analysis revealed that there were significant differences in the means of needs at the level of ($\alpha = 0.01$) in the domain of curriculum due to the effect of sex only, in favor of the teachers. No significant differences at the same level between the means of the training needs related to the effect of stage was obtained. Moreover, the results of ANOVA analysis revealed that there were no significant differences at the ($\alpha = 0.01$) between the means of needs belonging to the effect of the levels of experience.

In light of the research results, the researcher recommends that all those concerned with the training needs of teachers take into consideration the abovementioned needs in any instructional program related to Islamic education. Moreover, the supervisors should concentrate on the teachers' needs that require growth and development. Thus, the researcher suggests that more studies that aim at investigating the training needs of Islamic education teachers at the elementary level should be conducted. More studies are needed to investigate the problems encountered by teachers, in addition to measuring the effectiveness of training on all aspects of teachers' training needs in order to improve the level of performance of Islamic education teachers.

Keywords: Needs Assessment, In-Service Teachers' Training, Islamic Education, Training Needs of Islamic Education Teachers.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University. Received on 6/10/2003 and Accepted for Publication on 2/6/2004.